UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,048	08/21/2003	George C. Schedivy	8002A-65	6545
	7590 12/01/200 SSOCIATES, LLC	8	EXAMINER	
130 WOODBU	RY ROAD	YENKE, BRIAN P		
WOODBURY,	NY 11/9/		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2622	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/01/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/645,048	SCHEDIVY, GEORGE C.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
BRIAN P. YENKE	2622		

		BIND WITE TENNE	1 2022	
The MAILING DATE of	of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 19 November	2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
application in condition for a	imely file one of the following l llowance; (2) a Notice of Appe	the same day as filing a Notice of replies: (1) an amendment, affidaveal (with appeal fee) in compliance FR 1.114. The reply must be filed	rit, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expire	smonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
no event, however, will the	statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailir b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH	ng date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained un have been filed is the date for purpose under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated fro set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any	es of determining the period of ext m: (1) the expiration date of the s reply received by the Office later	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. ension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orion than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
may reduce any earned patent term at NOTICE OF APPEAL	ijustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).			
NOTICE OF AFFEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was fil	ad an A brief in samp	liance with 27 CEP 41 27 must be	filed within two months	of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (3	7 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37 into the sign that the time period set forth in 37	o avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	, will <u>not</u> be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues (b) They raise the issue o	that would require further cor f new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NO w);	TE below);	
	to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially re	educing or simplifying the	ne issues for
appeal; and/or	al claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	acted claims	
	37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rej	ected ciaims.	
	, ,,	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	omnliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324)
	ome the following rejection(s):		ompliant Amendment (i	1 OL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amende		owable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
	proposed amendment(s): a) [aims would be rejected is prov	will not be entered, or b) wided below or appended.	ill be entered and an ex	xplanation of
The status of the claim(s) is		• •		
Claim(s) allowed:				
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:				
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from cor	ısideration: .			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDEN				
 The affidavit or other eviden because applicant failed to p was not earlier presented. 	provide a showing of good and	t before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affida		
	it or other evidence failed to o	a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
 The affidavit or other evide REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERA 	The state of the s	n of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration See Continuation Sheet. 	ation has been considered but	t does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Informat 13. ☐ Other:	on Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
		/BRIAN P. YENKE/		
		Primary Examiner, Art U	Jnit 2622	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's Arguments:

- a) Applicant states that both Nagata and Kitano disclose a display that is mounted on an outisde surface of the pivoting door and the media player that is mounted on an inside surface of the door opposite the outside surface.
- b) Applicant states that In Nagata (Fig 6) the video reproducing unit 6 is not disposed on an opposite surface to the display monitor 2, nor discloses a pivoting door. Thus Nagata does not disclose a display that is mounted on an outside surface of the pivoting door, and the media player is mounted on an inside surface of the door opposite the outside surface.
- c) Applicant states that Kitano does not include a media player mounted on an opposite surface of the display panel 14, and at most Kitano discloses a display panel that rotates.. Thus Kitano does not disclose a display that is mounted on an outside surface of the pivoting door, and the media player is mounted on an inside surface

Examiner's Response

- a) -b) The examiner disagrees. As shown in Fig 6 (the media device) is perpendicular (or behind) the display as shown, given the broadest reasonable interpretation, wherein they would be parallel in the closed position. Nagata does disclose a pivoting/rotating display (2) about the media player 6 which is able to put the two at the perpendicular or parallel position. It is noted the examiner incorporated Oakley pertaining to the mounted on the outstide..., however the applicant has not argued this reference pertaining to the claim rejections. It is noted that Oakley discloses the display may be in front of or behind the media device, thus evidencing the features as claimed.
- a),c) The examiner disagrees. Initially it is noted that the examiner incorporpated Kitano to illustrate the feature of a rotateable headrest, and that Oakley was incorporated to evidence the mounting outside limitation, which was not addressed by the applicant.

3